



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/591,176  | 08/30/2006  | Atsushi Sano         | 129277              | 7454             |
| 25944   | 7590        | 01/11/2012           | EXAMINER            |                  |
| OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC<br>P.O. BOX 320850<br>ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850 |             |                      |                     | BEST, ZACHARY P  |
| ART UNIT  |             | PAPER NUMBER         |                     |                  |
| 1727  |             |                      |                     |                  |
|   |             |                      | NOTIFICATION DATE   |                  |
|   |             |                      | DELIVERY MODE       |                  |
|   |             |                      | 01/11/2012          |                  |
|   |             |                      | ELECTRONIC          |                  |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

OfficeAction25944@oliff.com  
jarmstrong@oliff.com

|  |                                      |                                    |
|--|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <b>Applicant-Initiated Interview Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>10/591,176 | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>SANO ET AL. |
|  | <b>Examiner</b><br>ZACHARY BEST      | <b>Art Unit</b><br>1727            |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) ZACHARY BEST. (3) \_\_\_\_.

(2) STEVE JINKS. (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 04 January 2012.

Type:  Telephonic  Video Conference  
 Personal [copy given to:  applicant  applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted:  Yes  No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_.

Issues Discussed  101  112  102  103  Others

(For each of the checked box(es) above, please describe below the issue and detailed description of the discussion)

Claim(s) discussed: 7.

Identification of prior art discussed: Jaouen, Sterzel.

#### Substance of Interview

(For each issue discussed, provide a detailed description and indicate if agreement was reached. Some topics may include: identification or clarification of a reference or a portion thereof, claim interpretation, proposed amendments, arguments of any applied references etc...)

Applicant first discussed the necessity of the triple-point interface as claimed in Claim 7, which was lacking in Jaouen because the schematics of Jaouen accompanied with par. 29 appeared to teach that the cation exchange resin would cut off the anion exchange resin / catalyst interface from touching the anion exchange membrane. Examiner strongly disagrees given the actual method that Jaouen teaches wherein the anion exchange resin / catalyst mix is applied to the membrane first, and THEN the cation exchange resin is applied thereon. There is no teaching that the cation exchange resin somehow moves in and encapsulates the pre-applied anion exchange resin / catalyst mix already interfacing the membrane.

Applicant also proposed a negative recitation of discusing a cation exchange resin, supported by instant specification, pg. 17, par. 54. Applicant further argued that one skilled in the art would include both ionic exchange resins of Jaouen into Sterzel because of the lowered conductivity of the anion exchange resin as taught by Jaouen, par. 7. Examiner will have to further consider Sterzel, specifically as to whether Sterzel would accommodate both resins or dislodge the cation resin. However, Examiner believes that the proposed amendment and argument would likely overcome the current art rejection. Due to the substantial amendment, however, further search and/or consideration would be required.

**Applicant recordation instructions:** The formal written reply to the last Office action must include the substance of the interview. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, applicant is given a non-extendable period of the longer of one month or thirty days from this interview date, or the mailing date of this interview summary form, whichever is later, to file a statement of the substance of the interview

**Examiner recordation instructions:** Examiners must summarize the substance of any interview of record. A complete and proper recordation of the substance of an interview should include the items listed in MPEP 713.04 for complete and proper recordation including the identification of the general thrust of each argument or issue discussed, a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed regarding patentability and the general results or outcome of the interview, to include an indication as to whether or not agreement was reached on the issues raised.

Attachment

/ZACHARY BEST/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1727

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
PTOL-413 (Rev. 8/11/2010)

**Interview Summary**

Paper No. 20120104

**Summary of Record of Interview Requirements****Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record**

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

**Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews**  
Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,  
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

**Examiner to Check for Accuracy**

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.